1 INTRODUCTION

The Women’s 17 European Championship (ECh) took place from 29.06 – 07.07.2007 in Slovakia. The matches of the 16 participating teams were held in Bratislava in the Sibamac Arena NTC and the Pasienky sports hall.

Fifty-six games were played in total and in terms of team performance, the most balanced qualification groups were A and D. From these two groups only Norway and Croatia failed to qualify to the main round; however their performance did contribute to the overall level at the ECh. Over the course of ten days, each team played 7 matches, thus presenting a high playing load. Towards the close of the ECh, a few matches did not achieve the excellent level of the matches played during the qualification groups. This was due to fatigue and injuries of the best players.

Taking into consideration the summer holiday period, the number of spectators at the matches were satisfactory. Most of the matches were played in front of 300-600 spectators; 1100 spectators watched the finals. The matches of the W17 ECh in Slovakia were also transmitted online via video streaming. More information and impressions from the event can be found at www.euro2007.sk or at www.eurohandball.com. The above average interest shown by the press and television for the matches in this age category has contributed to the development of handball. A complete statistical report and a DVD of the match were available to the teams after the end of all matches.

In the qualitative analysis of the teams, we concentrated on the performance of 6 nations (FRA, ESP, NED, RUS, SRB and DEN). From our point of view, with the possibility to choose the team players, implementation of the defensive and attacking playing systems of these teams were the most progressive in this age category.

2 STATISTICAL PARAMETERS

2.1 W17 EURO 2007

Table 1: Standings after Main Round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>Pts</th>
<th>Goal diff.</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>Pts</th>
<th>Goal diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>NED</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SRB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FRA was excellent with a very movable 5:1 defence system. The frontal player was defending distances 12-14m from the team’s own goal; all defending players were using brilliant techniques, which resulted in winning the Fair Play prize of the ECh. The winning team of the championship played very well in the first and the second wave of the fast break. The power of the team was in the well organised gradual attack laid in the simple combination system that consisted of the additional player running into the pivot’s space, followed by excellently handled individual activity or cooperation with pivot. A selection of quick and dynamic player types is a precondition of the high performance for this team in the future.

ESP was successful mainly because of very good handling of two defence systems. The system 6:0 was realised with the excellent central block; and the 3:2:1 defence system was realised with extremely active ball direction movement. The set attack was managed through simple combinations followed by perfectly handled feint motions.

NED is probably a team of the future. The team’s performance is well balanced, maybe only the pivot’s performance was evidently better than the rest of her teammates. The team played mainly a 6:0
defence system, from which not only the first and the second wave of counterattack were realised but also the “fast throw-off”. The strength of the team was partly in the interaction between the players within the set attack and in cooperation with the pivot.

**RUS** was marked as one of the competition favourites. They produce a 6:0 defence system and protuberant active 5:1 defence system, where the base position of the players defending at the back line of the defence system was placed at the level of the free throw line. A strong weapon of the team was the second wave of the counterattack mostly finished with the shot from the area of back player, very often from standing position. The team played counterattack also when they played with numerical disadvantage. In the set attack the team played simple combination based on run-in of an additional player into the pivot area. The low level of improvisation proved a weakness of the team, as well as the right-handed player in the position of the right back player.

**SRB** was the surprise of the tournament. The team's play was based on the 6:0 defence system, the second wave of counterattack and the high level of improvisation following basic attack combinations. In gradual attack, the team was strong mainly in positions of pivot and middle back player.

**DEN** played modern handball. The reason that lessened a good performance of the team was that they didn't change the rhythm of the play during the crucial phases of the match. As one of the few teams, they have a well-developed “fast throw-off” attack system. The team played full-area handball with very good running phase of the back players. The result of Danish matches often depended on the performance of one single player (middle back player).

There is one team, although not ranking among the first six teams that cannot be omitted here. In fact, the team of **NOR** played very nice handball at a fast pace. Even this style did not attain success during this Championship; the work out concept of the game and selection of the players will bring achievement and a much better placement (than the ECh 9th place) in the near future.

### 2.2 All Star Team W17 EURO 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Player Name</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goalkeeper</td>
<td>Marta ZDERIC</td>
<td>CRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Wing</td>
<td>Marta LOPEZ HERRERO</td>
<td>ESP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Back</td>
<td>Nora MOERK</td>
<td>NOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Back</td>
<td>Lotte GRIGEL</td>
<td>DEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Player</td>
<td>Yvette BROCH</td>
<td>NED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Back</td>
<td>Gnosiane NIOMBLA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Wing</td>
<td>Martina RINGAYEN</td>
<td>FRA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Top Scorer:       | Milena KNEZEVIC              | MNE         | 65 goals
| Defence Player:   | Estefania DESCALZO PEREZ     | ESP         |
| Most Valuable Player: | Tatiana KHMYROVA         | RUS         |

### 2.3 Team Parameter

#### Age and International Matches

**Table 2: Age/International Matches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>IM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NED</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top 6 Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As personal data about the players in the Danish team were not published, as a starting point we have used data of the first five teams only (see Table 2). We were dealing only with players actively participating at the Championship. In Russian and Danish team, 17 players performed during the European Championship; the remaining four teams used 16 players. The youngest team was Serbia with two 15-year old players, six 16-year old players and eight 17-year old players. The French team had six 16-year old players at the ECh, in the remaining teams, 2–4 16-year old players were in the delegation.

A typical feature of the monitored age category is low number of international matches, which is understandable from the point of view of the long-term sport preparation of the 17-year old players. France had the highest number of international matches (13.7); Spain had the lowest number (7.1). Among individual players, the player with the highest number of international matches was Russian player Tatiana Khmyrova (53), who was at the same time voted the most valuable player of the tournament.

**Height**

Table 3: Height of the players

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>No. Players</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>$&lt; 169$ cm</th>
<th>$170 - 179$ cm</th>
<th>$180 +$ cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>173.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>174.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NED</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>172.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>175.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>173.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEN</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total average</strong></td>
<td><strong>173.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data in table 3 describes a selection of players in the first five best teams of the ECh according to the body height. Average body height of the teams was 173.9cm. The teams of France, Spain and Russia had 4-6 players taller than 180cm in their delegation. The Netherlands had only one player taller than 180cm (pivot), whereas up to 12 players were taller than 170cm.

**Time Played (TP)**

Table 4: Time played

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>No. Players</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>0 min</th>
<th>24%</th>
<th>25% - 49%</th>
<th>50% - 74%</th>
<th>75% +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>420 min</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>420 min</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NED</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>420 min</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>420 min</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>420 min</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEN</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>420 min</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total average</strong></td>
<td><strong>420 min</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows that all teams were trying to spread the match stress out over the whole team during the tournament. The most successful teams being France and Denmark with 3-4 players playing for a 24% period of the playing time and only 1 player playing for more than 75% of the playing time. On the contrary, in the Serbian team as many as 5 players performed through more than 75% of the playing time. For the team of Netherlands it was 4 players from their delegation.
Match results

Table 5: Match results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Total average match result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>30:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>25:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NED</td>
<td>31:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>28:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB</td>
<td>26:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEN</td>
<td>29:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>28:25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results of the seven matches played by each team we can state that the average score of the top six teams of the ECh was 28:25 (See Table 5). From the point of view of the goals scored, the best team was the Netherlands (31 goals); the most successful team in the defence phase was France (22 goals).

3 ATTACKING PHASE OF THE GAME - TRENDS

3.1 Attacking activities of the individuals – developments

3.1.1 Handling the passes

- Universal players with various types of passes, often very swift (DEN, NOR), gained the foreground
- Handling the ball with one hand occurred often, mainly in the counterattack (video 3.1.1)
- Passes from the back player to the far away wing and passes in flight in opposite direction also occurred often
- Very important was also one-handed pass to the area of the wing
- Players often passed risky balls to the teammate defended tightly by an opponent

3.1.2 Shot from back player area

- Running and preparation phase for shot is shortening
- Running phase without ball appeared as the most decisive shooting phase
- Players tried to avoid being blocked by short run-off sideways from a defender or by side flexion in flight

3.1.3 Shot from wing area

- The best teams’ wing’s starting position was in the corner
- It was common standard to handle the inaccurate pass within the running phase
- In duels with a goalkeeper an effort in change of shooting style was observed

3.1.4 Shot from pivot area

- Movement after a dynamic screen or accurately timed movement into an open area were the most decisive moments for the pivot
- One-handed ball handling often occurred
- Pivots were shooting in flight and while falling into the goalkeeper’s area as well

3.1.5 Taking a free position within feint movement without and with the ball

Back player:

- Realised the feint motion from both sides
- Very notable was release to the opposite direction of shooting hand
- Dynamic in flight on both feet occurred very often
- Releases were “jumped” and very aggressive, heading direction into the goal area
Pivot:
- During release movement, fast footwork was evident
- During release movement without ball, usage of various "feint" motions occurred
- After handling the ball, very quick turn followed

Wing:
- There was often perceptible release movement behind front line defenders
- An ability to foresee the situation and running out from the defence system into the first phase of the counterattack was apparent
- Dynamic release motion 1:1 occurred in the second wave of counterattack

3.1.6

7-Metre throws
- Each team out of the top 6 teams had one specialist player with 91% to 79% shooting effectiveness
- Only in Serbian team two players were alternating during the 7m throws, other team's involved 4-6 players in this activity

Shooting effectiveness from various areas in front of the goalkeeper area

![Graph](image)

Picture 1: Shooting effectiveness from the various areas in the organised attack

Shooting effectiveness from various areas in front of the goalkeeper area was compared to the effectiveness of the first six best teams of the Women's ECh 2006. The most striking difference not in favour of the 17-year old players was in the shooting effectiveness from the wing area (41% - 51%). Participation of the wings in organised (gradual) attack actually decline, the wings were orientated just to finish the attack. On the contrary, comparatively high shooting effectiveness was observed at the position of back players (43% - 34%). Seventeen-year-old players often shot from the standing position; when shooting in flight, players often used to avoid organised blocks of the opponents. Each team out of the top 6 teams had at least one excellent back player who was great in shooting from longer distances. Based on high shooting effectiveness from the back player area, also shooting effectiveness in the organised (gradual) attack (OA) was rather high, compared to adult women (55% - 49%).
Picture 2: Share of goals shot in organised attack from various areas in front of the goalkeeper area

It is obvious, comparing share of the goals shot in the organised attack, that women aged 17 used to shoot with jumping into the goalkeeper area after feint actions (22% - 14%). To the contrary, a very low number of goals came from the wing area (13% - 18%) and from longer distance shots (9m) of the back player area (30% - 35%). Taking a free position by the feint actions in front of the goalkeeper area probably pass through a certain kind of revival; but for handball in general, a decrease in the numbers of goals from the area of wing is not satisfactory.

Positioning of shot goals shot by the top 6 teams into the 9 segments of the goal is also interesting (Table 8). Most frequently, the teams successfully shot the goal into the sectors VII and IX, i.e. into the lower corners of the goal (not less than 41% of all goals scored). As many as 47% of all goals were landed in segments I, IV and VII of the goal area for example: on the right side from the goalkeeper’s perspective.

Table 6: Positioning of shot goals in individual segments of the goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I. 16%</th>
<th>II. 6%</th>
<th>III. 12%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>V.</td>
<td>VI. 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>VIII. 8%</td>
<td>IX. 19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Attacking systems – development trends

- The top 6 of the ECh used simple combinations with a number of alternative endings, being flexible against various defensive systems
- A cooperation of a pair in a small area was the determining factor for the successful attack
- Teams with different player types have an advantage (against various defensive systems)
- Only Serbia and Russia used a smaller number of combinations and used more individual improvisational skills of the players
- Only Netherlands, Norway and Denmark used the organised system of the “fast throw-off”, the rest of the teams used this startling type of the attack sporadically
The first wave counterattack was quite frequent at the ECh
All monitored teams used the second wave counterattack

Effectiveness of various types of attack

Effectiveness of attacks was evaluated on the basis of number of goals scored in an organised attack and in a fast break. The evaluation was influenced by the fact that statistical program did not specify a difference between the organised attack and the second wave of counterattack. On the basis of our monitoring we can say most of the teams used mainly the second wave of counterattack on a much larger scale than the resulting 20% from a proportion of all goals scored in a game (Picture 3). On the basis of relatively high shooting effectiveness from the back player area (55% - 49%), effectiveness of shooting in organised attack was also markedly higher compared to adult women. Effectiveness from the break was almost at the same level (Picture 4).

Picture 3: Shot goal percentage from various types of attacks

Picture 4: Effectiveness of the various types of attacks

3.2.1 Organised offensive

- The first six teams of the ECh were using five to six simple combinations; dominating by perfectly organised individual action and cooperation of two players
- Back players were in a starting position throughout the width of the court, speed of the players within initial movement was very fast, and after crossing their places they tried to occupy the entire space in front of the goal area
Cooperation of the back player and the pivot was crucial in all special combinations; all teams have minimum of two back players, who were able to shoot varied and strong long distance shots.

All teams observed a transition from one-pivot system to the system with two pivots.

**Organised attack phases**

**Organised attack against defence system 6:0 (6:0)**

FRA video 3.2.1.1  
ESP video 3.2.1.2  
NED video 3.2.1.3  
RUS video 3.2.1.4  
SRB video 3.2.1.5  
DEN video 3.2.1.6  
NOR video 3.2.1.7

**Organised attack against extend defence systems (5:1, 4:2)**

FRA video 3.2.1.8  
ESP video 3.2.1.9  
RUS video 3.2.1.10  
SRB video 3.2.1.11  
DEN video 3.2.1.12  
NOR video 3.2.1.13

**Organised attack against combined defence systems (5+1, 4+2)**

FRA video 3.2.1.14  
DEN video 3.2.1.15

**Attacking system with one player more**

ESP video 3.2.1.16  
NED video 3.2.1.17  
RUS video 3.2.1.18  
SRB video 3.2.1.19

**Attacking system with one player less**

FRA video 3.2.1.20  
NED video 3.2.1.21  
DEN video 3.2.1.22

**9 m throw**

FRA video 3.2.1.23  
ESP video 3.2.1.24  
NED video 3.2.1.25  
RUS video 3.2.1.26  
SRB video 3.2.1.27  
DEN video 3.2.1.28

**Play 7:6**

NOR video 3.2.1.29
3.2.2 Counterattack

Trends in counterattack realisation:

- Players followed their own running tracks
- Players crossed rarely
- Basic position of the team in front of goalkeeper area was mainly with one pivot
- Only the team of Norway had a basic position with two pivots
- The first phase of the counterattack was very effective within each team of the top 6 ECh
- During the counterattack some of the teams changed one player
- Final shot of the counterattack was realised mainly by regrouping with one more player in the wings area or by back player shooting from distance through gap in unorganised defence of the opponent

Fast Break Phases

The 1st wave of counterattack

FRA video 3.2.2.1
NED video 3.2.2.2
RUS video 3.2.2.3
DEN video 3.2.2.4

The 2nd wave of counterattack

FRA video 3.2.2.5
NED video 3.2.2.6
RUS video 3.2.2.7
SRB video 3.2.2.8
DEN video 3.2.2.9

Throw-off

Throw-off after the goal of the opponent

DEN video 3.2.2.10
NOR video 3.2.1.11

4 DEFENSIVE PHASE OF THE GAME - TRENDS

- Each of the teams of the top 6 ECh presented with 2-3 defensive systems, most frequently 6:0 and 5:1
- Each team had at least one basic and one alternative defensive system with 6 players of both teams in a field
- Behaviour of the players in defence was very correct, players belonging to the top 6 teams of this tournament were technically on a level of a high quality (the average number of exclusions in the top 6 teams was 4, the European Champion France, had 3 exclusions on average)
- Cooperation with goalkeeper – blocking was not obviously noticed; number of direct blockings diminished (on average 5 blocks per team for a match)
- There was an effort in each defence system to gain the ball, followed by counterattack (on average 9 gains of the ball per match)
- Most of the teams did not try to interrupt or stop the game (through fouls); they tried to put an opponent at a disadvantageous shooting position or to a passive play (the average number of game stops was 21, the average number for the Netherlands was 31)
Each team possessed one specialist player – defender, usually it was the middle defender. Some of the teams had a player situated in the area of the left outer defender who was necessary for the fast break system of the team (ESP). When in numerical advantage, the teams mostly realised combination system 5+1; only teams of Spain and Denmark used often defensive system (6:0). When the teams played in numerical disadvantage no special practice in defensive systems was observed.

**BASIC DEFENSIVE SYSTEM**

Each team of the ECh top 6 had their typical defensive system they were using during the most part of the match. The basic system, probably from tactical reasons, was alternated in teams of Spain and Russia.

**France**  
5:1 Outer defender was defending at the 12-14m position from the own goal [video 4.1]

**Spain**  
6:0 Massive central block; defenders positioned second from the side line were offensive, clear movement in ball direction, [video 4.2]

**Netherlands**  
6:0 Offensive central block; defenders positioned second from the side line approached free-throw line level, [video 4.3]

**Russia**  
5:1 Extremely active defender, the base position of the players defending at the back line of the defence system was placed at the level of the free-throw line, [video 4.4]

**Serbia**  
6:0 Massive central blocking, positioned not very much in front, active were defenders positioned second from the side line, [video 4.5]

**Denmark**  
6:0 Offensive central blocking

**ALTERNATIVE DEFENSIVE SYSTEM**

Each team of the ECh top 6 used one to two alternative defensive systems, mostly based on different tactical principles according to the defensive area depth (6:0 or more active/offensive/defence system)

**France**  
5+1, 6:0 Outer defender – tight personal defence, [video 4.6]

**Spain**  
3:2:1 Defence with transition to 3:3 system, very demanding defence for this age category; the team won decisive match (semi-finals against Russia) because of this defensive system; defending large defence area within active movement in the direction of the ball were typical of this system, [video 4.7]

**Netherlands**  
5:1, 5+1 Outer defender at the 9-11m position

**Russia**  
6:0 Two variants: defensive up to the 8m level and the other with access beyond the free-throw line level

**Serbia**  
5+1 Tight personal defence of outer defender

**Denmark**  
5-1 Two variants: offensive player at the 11-12m level with transition to 6:0 system and outer defender almost 190cm tall, [video 4.8]
**DEFENCE SYSTEM WITH ONE PLAYER MORE**

Two teams of the ECh top 6 performed a basic defensive system with higher mobility of the players; remaining teams were using a combined defensive system 5+1.

**France**  
5+1, 4:2  
All players took an active part in defence with access beyond the free-throw line level

**Spain**  
6:0, 4:2  
Mostly, the team was using a more active version of the basic defensive system, video 4.9

**Netherlands**  
5+1  
Tight personal defence of outer defender

**Russia**  
5+1  
Outer defender was defending at the 14-15m level; basic position of the back line of defence area was placed at the free-throw line level

**Serbia**  
5+1  
Tight personal defence of outer defender

**Denmark**  
6:0  
Very active movement in direction of the ball, video 4.10

**DEFENCE SYSTEM WITH ONE PLAYER LESS**

In this kind of defence no special practice in defensive systems was observed. All teams were using defensive system 5:0 with more or less active approaching to the player with ball. In the last minutes of the match FRA-DEN, team of DEN used defensive system 4:1.

**5 THE GOALKEEPER’S PLAY - TRENDS**

The first three teams of the ECh engaged two goalkeepers; Russia, Serbia and Denmark used three goalkeepers actively. Each team had the so-called “first” goalkeeper who was given more opportunities in the matches by the coaches. Difference in catching effectiveness between the first and the second goalkeeper was apparent in the first two teams (France, Spain). Effectiveness of the goalkeepers in the last teams of the ECh top 6 who were not playing so often was considerably better.

**OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS OF THE GOALKEEPER IN THE TEAM:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>First goalkeeper</th>
<th>Second goalkeeper</th>
<th>Team Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Bonche (40%)</td>
<td>Leythienne (33%)</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Guerra Perez (38%)</td>
<td>De La Torre Perez (22%)</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Wissink (33%)</td>
<td>Terlouw (34%)</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia (3)</td>
<td>Konova (32%)</td>
<td>Kretova (31%)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia (3)</td>
<td>Colic (32%)</td>
<td>Georgijev (39%)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark (3)</td>
<td>Krasniqi (33%)</td>
<td>Soby (46%)</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EFFECTIVENESS OF THE GOALKEEPER FROM THE VARIOUS AREAS:

The most apparent difference in the effectiveness of the goalkeepers of the ECh top 6 and other teams was in catching effectiveness from the area of back player (51%). Catching effectiveness from other areas was approximately at the same level. The best effectiveness was achieved by the goalkeepers of Croatia (40%) followed by the teams of France, Denmark and Slovakia (37%).

![Graph showing effectiveness of goalkeepers from various areas](image.png)

Picture 5: Goalkeepers’ effectiveness from the various areas in front of the goalkeeper area

### 6 GENERAL TRENDS

**Attack**

- The top 6 of the ECh used simple combinations with number of final alternatives, being flexible against various defensive systems
- A cooperation of a pair in a small area was a determining factor for successful attack
- Teams with different types of player have an advantage (against various defensive systems)
- Only Serbia and Russia used a smaller number of combinations and used more individual improvisational skills of the players
- Only Netherlands, Norway and Denmark used an organised system of the “quick centre”, the rest of the teams used this startling type of the attack sporadically
- The first wave counterattack had quite a high frequency at the ECh
- The second wave counterattack was used by all monitored teams

**Defence**

- Each team of the top 6 ECh used 2-3 defensive systems, most frequently 6:0 and 5:1
- Behaviour of the players in defence was very correct, players belonging to the top 6 teams of this tournament were technically on a level of a high quality (the average number of exclusions in the top 6 teams was 4, the European Champion France, had 3 exclusions on average)
- There was an effort in each defence system to gain possession of the ball, followed by counterattack (on average 9 gains of the ball per match)

- Each team possessed one specialist player – defender, usually it was the middle defender

- When playing in numerical advantage, the teams mostly realised combination system 5+1; only teams of Spain and Denmark used often defensive system (6:0)

- The most apparent difference in effectiveness of the goalkeepers of the ECh top 6 and the remainder of the teams was in catching effectiveness from the area of back player (51%)